

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Application is being filed as a continuation Application under the RCE procedure (Request for continued Examination) to present claims which according to the Examiner require further search.

New claim 18 is being submitted and a claim quite close to the present claim 18 was sent to the Examiner for discussion; and the present claim 18 was further formally amended. This claim 18 adds further structure which the Examiner requested.

New claim 18 includes the structure of the two conduits and the single quantity of liquid. The single quantity of liquid has been heretofore discussed and it is understood that the Examiner did not consider this to be sufficient. With respect to the two conduits, clearly, Cavazos does not have two conduits for the structure to operate, but Cavazos requires three conduits and is inoperable with two conduits. In addition, the heat exchange 9 and the condensing chamber 8 are completely different from what is shown by Cavazos. Cavazos only has a single tube 18 or conduit 18 which is provided with the manifold 16. Cavazos uses feed line 22 and exit line 24 for the flowing of the secondary coolant. These are two additional conduits. This is the reason Applicant's attorney repeats the fact that a single coolant is considered to be a material limitation in the claim because Cavazos uses two coolants and therefore requires and must have the additional or third conduit, and hence a different structural configuration. In effect, if the Examiner wishes to define conduits alone, Cavazos has three conduits, 18, 22 and 24, whereas Applicant's invention is limited to only two conduits and uses the same fluid or single quantity of liquid for the molding process and the proposed cooling, etc. It is for these reasons that

the single quantity of liquid is considered to be a structural limitation, and this is the reason Applicant is able to eliminate one conduit from its apparatus. Moreover, Applicant requires only one flow path, whereas Cavazos requires two paths of flow.

Applicant's instructing attorney-principle and the inventor have provided some additional comments which it is desired to pass on to the Examiner to clearly distinguish the present invention from Cavazos. The reason the inventor considers his contribution to the art to be important is clearly set forth in what he has done with respect to the particular structure.

Accordingly, the following information is provided for the Examiner:

The present invention proposes and wants to keep a substantially uniform temperature within the molding cavity throughout the molding process where the degree of variation is very small indeed if possible.

The inventor Mr. James has pointed out that his moment of light arrived when he realized that he could make the internal chambers having a shape which allowed a relatively uniform separation distance through the walls of the die with respect to each part of the molding surface of the die so that, provided the surface inside the cooling chamber was kept at a relatively uniform temperature, then because of heat transfer rates, by having a consistent thickness from a closest part of any chamber to the respective molding surface face meant that the molding surface faces temperatures could be kept within a very tight tolerance indeed.

Because the present invention has a chamber in which the water that is evaporating off the surface is distributed and therefore affecting maintenance of a

relatively constant temperature; perhaps within two or three degrees, this is then quite different to Cavazos.

Cavazos puts in round bores where the thickness of material between a respective surface of the bore and the molding surfaces, would be significantly different from place to place and from bore to bore.

There is of course no discussion in Cavazos of this because fundamentally, Cavazos is about removing heat not maintaining a uniformity of heat.

It is true that one needs to remove heat to obtain some form of uniformity, but it is a quite different purpose to establish and maintain uniformity which then allows for much superior molding where all sorts of properties of the molded product can be changed by reason of different temperatures and cooling rates that otherwise can be caused.

Typically, by keeping the mold relatively uniform in temperature because of this close following of the chamber wall to the shape of the molding surface, means that cycle time, which is critical in plastic moldings, can be significantly reduced and in some cases up to 50% reduction in cycle time needed for a molding to be achievable.

While structure has been added previously, Applicant considers the single quantity of liquid to be structure because the apparatus enables the single quantity of liquid in combination with the portions that it comes into contact with to define a single self-contained structure.

Applicant's attorney, the undersigned, further desires to bring to the Examiner's attention that there is no discussion or teaching in Cavazos about uniformity of heat which is accomplished with the single quantity of fluid, liquid.

With respect to the claims, all of the claims submitted are structurally and patentably distinguishing from Cavazos, regardless of how considered.

Claim 21 is specifically directed to a mold for molding plastic materials. Clearly the Examiner may take notice that glass is not a plastic, and vice-versa, and therefore Cavazos should be withdrawn as a reference. With respect to claims 18 to 20, Cavazos should be withdrawn for the reasons previously set forth. With respect to claim 22, Cavazos makes no claim to a die for glass. For claim 23, this is directed to the injection molding of plastics, not glass, and it is not believed that Cavazos would be operable in this respect. The same applies to claim 24.

The Examiner is also asked to respectfully review the earlier comments submitted with respect to the claims, and in particular the Supplemental Response sent by facsimile which contained a Declaration by the inventor.

In addition, the earlier Remarks and Arguments submitted are incorporated by reference.


If the Examiner considers that there are some outstanding points, he is respectfully asked to call Applicant's attorney in order to do what is necessary to place this Application into condition for allowance.

It is respectfully requested that all necessary extensions be obtained, and as presently considered, only a one (1) month term extension is required because the Notice of Appeal was received on January 2, 2004, and this Amendment and Request for an

RCE is being timely filed.

Respectfully submitted,
LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Harold Nissen", written over a horizontal line.

J. Harold Nissen

Reg. No. 17283

Customer No. 28752

Telephone No.: 914-723-4300

Fax No.: 914-723-4301